

REMARKS

The Examiner's recognition of Applicant's invention by the allowance of claims 2-5 is gratefully acknowledged.

Claim Rejection under 35 USC § 102(b) based on Wallace et al.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,188,314, issued to Wallace et al. in 2001 (herein Wallace '314).

The rejection points to Wallace '314. However, the reference numerals in the Examiner's reasons for rejection correspond to United States Patent No. 6,104,308, issued to Wallace et al. in 2000 (herein Wallace '308)

Whichever Wallace et al. reference is applied, it does not show compensation circuitry in a distributed architecture system that is responsive to bus current modulation to increase the bus voltage, a key aspect of Applicant's invention.

With regard to Wallace '308, the reference describes a central controller 14 comprising a voltage modulator 30 that is connected to a voltage signal decoder 44 in a restraint device 16 by a conductor 20, col. 2, lines 53-62, and col. 3, lines 33-39. No voltage compensation circuitry is shown in the wire connection, col. 2, lines 41-42. Nor does the description of the voltage signal decoder call for any compensation in voltage due the effect of current modulation, col. 3, lines 33-39. Rather, it is clear from the discussion beginning at col. 3, line 40, that Wallace '308 contemplates independent

processing of the voltage modulation and current modulation. Thus, there is no teaching in the patent to point the practitioner to provide compensation for the voltage in response to the current modulation. However, Applicant has found that current modulation may produce un-intended voltage modulation due to bus resistance, page 2, lines 3-7, and page 4, line 27, through page 5, line 10. Thus, Applicant's invention provides circuitry to increase voltage in response to modulation of the current, see page 4, lines 24-29. Nothing in Wallace '308 contemplates voltage compensation for current modulation. Therefore, Wallace '308 does not teach or suggest Applicant's invention.

Neither does Wallace '314 show Applicant's invention. Wallace '314 describes a voltage transmitter 44 in a central control unit 16 directly connected by bus 14 to a voltage receiver 58 in a hybrid master/slave 18 and a voltage receiver 64 in a slave 20, col. 4, lines 49-50; and col. 5, lines 17-19 and 35-36. Bus 14 does not include voltage compensation circuitry. Neither do the descriptions of transmitter 44, voltage receiver 58, and voltage receiver 64 point to adjustments to the voltage to compensate for current modulation. Indeed, Wallace '314 teaches that voltage fluctuations are ignored by the components, col. 6, lines 24-37. Thus, Wallace '314, like Wallace '308, contemplates independent voltage and current modulation, as opposed to compensation of one, i.e., voltage modulation, in response to the other, i.e., current modulation. Accordingly, Wallace '314 does not teach or suggest Applicant's invention.

Claim 1 calls for compensation circuitry that is responsive to modulation of the bus current and increases bus voltage. Wallace '308 and Wallace '314 describe

independent voltage and current modulation that ignores the adverse effects of one on the other, without any attempt to compensate. Therefore, whichever Wallace et al. reference is considered, it does not point to voltage compensation in response to current modulation, and so cannot teach or even suggest Applicant's invention as set forth in claim 1.


Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claim 1 be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that the claim be allowed.

Conclusion

It is believed, for the reasons above, that the grounds of rejection have been addressed and overcome, and that all claims are in condition for allowance. If it would further prosecution of the application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the phone number provided.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 50-0831.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Douglas D. Fekete", written over a horizontal line.

Douglas D. Fekete

Reg. No. 29,065

Delphi Technologies, Inc.

Legal Staff – M/C 480-410-202

P.O. Box 5052

Troy, Michigan 48007-5052

(248) 813-1210